BUILDING DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
Minutes of December 18, 2012 Meeting

Jon Morris opened the Building-Development Commission (BDC) meeting at 3:07 p.m. on Tuesday, December 18, 2012.

Present: Ed Horne, John Taylor, Hal Hester, Jon Morris, Elliot Mann, Harry Sherrill, Zeke Acosta, Jon Wood, Rob Belisle, Kevin Silva and Tim West

Absent: Bernice Cutler and Travis Haston

1. MINUTES APPROVED
The motion by Zeke Acosta, seconded by Rob Belisle, to approve the November 20, 2012 meeting minutes passed unanimously.

2. BDC MEMBER ISSUES AND COMMENTS
Zeke Acosta: The last 2 or 3 weeks have received emails that the permit is expiring but it doesn't tell me which permit is expiring and there is no way I can determine which permit is expiring.
PG: Please send me a .pdf of the next email you receive on expired permits and I'll have Wendell Dixon look into this.

3. PUBLIC ATTENDEE ISSUES
Joe Padilla invited everyone to an event on January 16th, 2013 at UNCC Center City building; we are bringing in an author named Joel Kotkin. Joel is an urban theorist and demographer out of Southern California; has written several books and many articles for Forbes about urban growth and planning issues. In his last book he talks quite a bit about Charlotte and how we are growing in household trends, etc. Should be a great presentation. Everyone is welcome to attend this public event. Flyers have been left on the front table. The event is from 1:30 – 3:00 on Wednesday the 16th. There is no charge for this event.

4. BDC 2011 Attendance Authentication
Rebecca Simcox distributed the attendance roster for authentification. Rebecca also asked all BDC members to review and verify member attendance by sending Rebecca an email by Friday, 12/21/12. In addition to the attendance roster; BDC members were given a 2013 meeting schedule. Members were asked to let Rebecca know if they found any discrepancies in their recorded attendances.
JM: Not to call out anyone in particular but we did have the County Commissioner comment on Will Caulder's attendance last year when it did not meet the requirement. Do you think we will hear from them again on Tim's attendance?
RS: Yes, without a doubt. Will handle off line.
TW: February, March and April I was in finals for my last semester which made attendance difficult.

5. Paperless Process Goal for the BDC
Patrick Granson described the department has been pursuing a goal to completely go paperless for the last 10 years. With the installation of CTAC-EPS, we are close to achieving that goal. The Code Administrators are 75% complete on a two year challenge to convert all Consistency team meetings, training classes and public presentations to 99% paperless. They will be there by 6/30/13. We now are pursuing the conversion of the BDC public meetings to a 90% paperless process in the next 3-7 months. The key to this is a establishing a schedule by which BDC members and regular visitors to BDC meetings can gain access to electronic copies in advance of the meeting, and either upload to their iPad or laptop for use in the meeting, or print out copies, if they need paper in front of them during the meeting. We are uncertain of how this will work in the annual BDC March Budget meeting. So we have adjusted the proposal goal down accordingly (11 of 12 months). Ultimately, we would like to get this in the paperless net as well.

The process would work as follows; the BDC would have a web page (you already have your individual monthly .pdf files). We will create tabs for the BDC to upload for each agenda item identified in the BDC agenda. We will load draft agendas seven (7) days in prior for review of the agenda. All basic BDC meeting materials (final agenda, minutes, charts, etc.) will be loaded by noon on the Friday before the meeting. This will include any materials supporting discussion of current initiative status. New business topics requiring supporting materials (handouts, PowerPoint presentations, etc.) would be loaded by noon on the Monday before for Tuesday's meeting. In January-April-June-October meetings with Quarterly Reports, those supporting documents would be loaded by noon on the Monday before Tuesday's meeting. There would be no paper handouts available at the meeting. To support those with no laptop or paper, all "electronic handout" items discussed during meetings would be projected onto a screen for the attending publics' reference. You can always make your own copies and bring it to the meeting. What do you members think of pursuing this process? We are looking at some mock of details of what this will look like if you want us to pursue it. We want you to know how to navigate this process. General comments?...

EH: I remember Danny Phillips saying one time, " your taking the tree out of your yard or out of my yard, it's the same effect as far as the overall. You could download, bring it here on your laptop; what do you suggest for us to bring; an ipad or a laptop?

PG: The concept has always been if you want to bring a laptop or ipad you can bring it with you but you can also print it off and bring it. For the public members; we will project handouts on screen.

JM: My question is; when you all take this home; how much of it do you use in reference if you didn't have it here and it popped up on a screen. Is that going to slow us down? I personally take notes and will save those pages but generally I throw away the BDC packages after three (3) months.

EM: For the first many years of being on the BDC I saved it then realized there were only 1 or 2 pertinant pages I needed to keep for reference or distribution then I leave the rest of it here on the table. If we had a stack of 3 or 4 packages there that if we needed to document we could grab from Rebecca after the meeting and otherwise we use electronics. Maybe a paper agenda is all we need.

JM: Actually it would be better if you had a library of past meetings that you can access from the web site so if you needed something from February or March's meeting you can weed back through. It will take some getting used to but if you are like Elliot and your bring your iPad/iPad's probably better. I don't see any down side if we are going to save a lot of paper and colored ink as well.

JT: We talked about this earlier this year and were asked if we wanted paper or download.

PG: We did this to get a feel for your needs.

JM: I think the first meeting you do like Elliot suggested; offer 2 or 3 BDC package copies for reference if needed. Let's give it a whirl.

EM: It probably takes new folks 5 – 6 meetings to catch up to JB's acronyms and running through the package so if it were on the screen when he is talking about it; it would probably be more beneficial for a lot of the group anyway.

PG: Moving forward we need to continue to provide 2 – 3 BDC package copies. This is still a 3 – 7 month transition as to work out the bugs. Then we have to create a web page which will be the next piece of this to come up with the TABS for navigation.

EM: Even if you just had a .pdf of every month's meeting; there's nothing in here that's not public information.

RB: I wouldn't get too complicated. I'd just throw a .pdf on the site and scroll through. There's no reason to have to deal with 4 tabs for 1 meeting because we want to print it as a .pdf anyway.

EM: Scan it in and be done. You can print 1 page of a .pdf if someone needs to go in and see it.

PG: So the only tab will be the meeting date; you can upload it; print it; view it and done.

EM: I don't think you need to go 7 months. Start it in the January meeting and go.

JM: Maybe in the January meeting you have 6 or 7 BDC package copies, see how many are left over and ween us off as quick as you can.

EM: I think a one page paper agenda is worthwhile for people to have if they need to take notes and follow along; but beyond that it's the only paper we would need.

PG: Not sure we can roll this out in January since we will have to set the web page up.

RB: You can still just have Rebecca email the BDC monthly package to us which would be easier than you explaining it is on the web site which would be the hardest part in finding it.

PG: The strategy that Jim is trying to cultivate is to make sure we have dates and times so you get that information when you want it. I don't know how the January meeting is going to work but I definitely see the point in sending the BDC monthly package to you in an email to print out when you want. Thank you.

6. ISO Audit Update

Gene Morton updated members on our ISO audit. On 11/29 we received our report from our submission. In their initial determination; Mecklenburg County gained a Commercial grade of 2 which is down from a 1 and a Residential grade of 3 which is up from our previous grade of 4. They identified specific points that led to our decline. The four items mentioned were;

    a) Reduction in staff since last evaluation.
    b) Reduction in staff training budget since last evaluation.
    c) Increase in staff workload per code official since last evaluation.
    d) Plan review and inspection checklists insufficient for full credit.

The good news is that we had the chance to appeal the decision and anything they note we have the opportunity to provide more information (which we've already done). We're getting good signals that our grade is improving significantly; maybe even better than the grade we received before but will wait until we receive official notification before we celebrate.

JM: What were the grades again?

GM: Commercial grade of 2; down from 1 (the 1 on Jim's lapel) and Residential grade 3 up from 4 last time. We believe both of those grades will improve.

EM: What's the best we ever had on the Residential?

GM: 4. We're at a 3 now; we added a lot of plan review and that was the one thing that kept us at a low grade before.

EH: Is this not a nationwide phenomon where departments all over the country have had reductions. Do they not give any consideration to that in regard to the economy?

GM: They look at it if you are not maintaining a staff that is sufficient to handle your workload; your grade goes down and depending on what time they audit us whether its before we add staff or just after we add staff it can effect our grade significantly. We think they are reviewing our new information. They have provided initial feedback that our grades will mostlikely improve.

EH: As a result of the economy slowing down in relation to the curve, you probably haven't dropped that significantly. When you think that departments all over this country have had to reduce staff.

GM: If they had graded us before our last 2 RIFs we would have come out very good. Staff to work ratios is the highest graded item.

HS: You also mentioned an inspection checklist?

GM: That's the one thing we are confused about because we've used the same checklist and improved on it since the last review and we received full credit for the checklist before. For some reason they marked it down this time. We think that was either an error or just didn't have all the information in front of them. We have since submitted that and they seem to be comfortable with our checklist now. We hope to report some high scores at the next meeting.

7. Review of RFBA's to BDC in January
Delay in "Homeowner as Contractor" Changes

Gene Morton recalled the BDC's support and BOCC approved this change, which applies to projects of $30k construction cost or less, where the homeowner also serves as the contractor (HAC). He briefly described that the Fee Ordinance change moved these projects to a "pay by the pound" format, for permitting, plan review and inspections, and are specifically addressed by Section II, Part D, Item 49.1. Charging by the inspection event assumed customers could pay by e-check or credit card. However, County Finance has suspended acceptance of e-checks until further notice. Credit card payment has run into similar problems and County Finance strongly recommends we wait until they

have a new electronic payment vendor on board to fix these issues and resume the HAC strategy. This may not be resolved until next October-November. So Marvin Bethune advised us, for now, to strike LUESA Fee Ordinance Part D, item 49.1. When the technical issue is resolved, we will return to the BDC & BOCC with another RFBA to reinsert the text currently described in LUESA Fee Ordinance Part D, item 49.1.
JM: Will the wording be such that you work through the changes until the current glitches are worked out? Or will you have to reinstate?
GM: As soon as we work out the details we will go through another RFBA to put the fees back in.
EM: This is just temporary?
GM: Yes, temporary. We will move as quickly as we can on this but it is beyond our hands right now. Jim will come back at the next meeting and ask for a motion for request. This is just a heads up at this time. At the next meeting Jim will have a RFBA on this subject to be taken to the commissioners that night. The reason he wanted to bring it up today is that he will have to send in preliminary paperwork saying he has the support of the BDC and wants to have the nod.

7.1.   Suspending Mechanical/Plumbing Journeyman's Exam

Willis Horton described that in 2011 we conducted a pilot on the Electrical Journeyman's Cards program, on 1/1/11, transferring the testing component to the state Electrical Contractors Trade Association. The program was highly successful. Since that time, the MP trades have studied a similar change, identifying the following strategy. This will suspend all Mechanical/Plumbing testing, except for Ventilation Contractors. As soon as the BOCC approves the proposed BDO changes (tentatively January 15), the Department will suspend tests, and in their place accept licensing by the NC Board of Plumbing, Heating and Fire Sprinkler Contractors (PHFSC Board). PHFSC Board will grandfather in all current Mecklenburg License holders in Plumbing, Heating Group 1, 2 & 3, and Fuel Gas, provided they apply by December 31, 2012. The Department has advised current license holders of the grandfather option through Consistency Meetings and an e mail blast. The PHFSC Board also discussed reciprocity in their September newsletter. The Department has developed a list of equivalent PHFSC Board license (see attachment. This requires changes to the Building-Development Ordinance (BDO) definitions and certificates section in several places (subject to review with County Attorney) including; 106: Journeyman Mechanic, 106: Journeyman Plumber, 106: State Mechanical Contractor License, 109A, 109B, 109C – Licenses and 109G – Homeowner Serving as Contractor. Other process issues were covered in BDO changes of Dec 7, 2010, made to support the Electrical Journeyman's card pilot.
ZA: I've got one employee that hasn't been reimbursed for last year.
WH: We'll still maintain if people want to renew with us. We won't be giving the test anymore but if they want license; we will still have card but not the test. We have covered this in the last two consistency meetings as well as the email blast that was sent out.

7.2.   Action Required by the BDC

Gene Morton stated that if the BDC has no objections to these two changes, JNB will prepare the supporting RFBA. We will request that the Manager's office place this on the January 15 BOCC agenda, indicating we've discussed it with you and anticipate full support. We will present the formal RFBA to you on January 15, with it going to the BOCC the same night. After some discussion with the BDC Gene Morton reiterated that the BDC was asking the department to prepare a letter requesting reconsideration of the cut-off date. Hal Hester indicated that they would send a letter out from the trade association as well. Jon Morris felt it somewhat robs the labor pool. He thinks his industry is going to experience the same thing as the department when work volume increases they will have to start hiring and there is just not as many people as there used to be, then to take some out from an administrative regulatory matter doesn't make a lot of sense but thanked the department for the feedback.

8. Department Statistics and Initiatives Report
8.1. Statistics Report
8.1.1. Permit Revenue
- November permit (only) revenue- $1,437,356, compares to October revenue of $1,642,006.
  - Fy13 budget projected monthly permit revenue; $14,892,963(*)/12 = $1,241,080
    - ❖ **These are new numbers, see note (*) below**
  - So October permit revenue is $196,276 above monthly projection
- At 11/30/12, YTD permit rev of $7,133,337 is above the YTD permit fee revenue projection ($6,205,400) by $927,937 or 14.95%
- Note (*); the December 4, 2012 BOCC approval of both RFBA's adjusted our expense and revenue picture as follows.
  - o Original revenue level of $13,752,732 bumped up $227,996 by OMB in Fy13 setup
  - o The 14 position betterment adds $912,235; so new Fy13 permit revenue total of $14,892,963
    - ▪ $13,752,732 + $227,996 + $912,235 = $14,892,963
  - o The 4 position ISO related betterment adds $263,265 to the Other Revenue projection.

8.1.2. Construction Value of Permits Issued
- November total - $253,379,393, compared to October total of $267,754,248
- YTD at Nov.30 of $1,150,663,271; this is <1%above constr value permit'd YTD at 11/30/11 of $1,147,032,152.

8.1.3. Permits Issued:

	October	November	3 Month Trend
Residential	3862	3482	3659/2994/3862/3482
Commercial	2734	2355	3134/2181/2734/2355
Other (Fire/Zone)	490	490	480/469/490/313
Total	7086	6150	7273/5644/7086/6150

- Residential down 10%__; commercial down 14%__; total down 13.2%
  - o The above permit counts are higher than typical November #'s (compared to November 2011, etc).
- Note; at Nov 30, SF detached permits YTD totaled 1250, compared to 917 at same time in Fy12 (up 36%)

8.1.4. Inspection Activity: inspections performed

Insp. Req.	Oct	Nov	Insp. Perf.	Oct	Nov	% Change
Bldg.	5458	4904	**Bldg.**	5414	4824	-10.9%
Elec.	6598	5939	**Elec.**	6577	5887	-10.5%
Mech.	3793	3732	**Mech.**	3702	3634	-1.85%
Plbg.	2892	2607	**Plbg.**	2855	2575	-9.8%
Total	18,741	17,182	**Total**	18,548	16,920	-8.78%

- Insp performed totals down 8.8%; with B/E/P all around 10% down and Mech down <2%
- Insp performed were 98.48% of inspections requested__

8.1.4.1 Inspection Activity: inspections response time (IRT Report)

Insp. Resp. Time	OnTime %		Total % After 24 Hrs. Late		Total % After 48 Hrs. Late		Average Resp. in Days	
	Oct	Nov	Oct	Nov	Oct	Nov	Oct	Nov
Bldg.	88.2	89.0	91.1	91.9	96.7	94.9	1.25	1.31
Elec.	90.4	90.7	92.0	92.0	98.5	96.2	1.19	1.26
Mech.	83.1	71.1	86.9	76.3	94.8	83.5	1.38	1.86
Plbg.	94.8	92.4	95.2	92.7	99.4	96.0	1.11	1.25
Total	89.0	86.2	91.2	88.7	97.4	93.0	1.24	1.4

- Overall down 2.8%; B&E about same, Plbg down 2.4%, Mech down significantly (12%)

8.1.4.2 IRT comparison to POSSE Insp Efficiency Report (IER)

1st - 24 hr average	IRT Nov rate	IER Nov rate	% difference	insp resp in days	IRT Nov av'g	IER Nov av'g	difference in days
Bldg.	89.0%	68.5%	-20.5%	**Bldg.**	1.31	1.59	-.32
Elec.	90.7%	62.1%	-28.6%	**Elec.**	1.26	1.51	-.29
Mech.	71.1%	24.6%	-46.5%	**Mech.**	1.86	2.25	-.35
Plbg	92.4%	74.6%	-17.8%	**Plbg.**	1.25	1.41	-.16
MT.	na	89.6%	na	**MT.**	Na	na	na
Total	86.2%	67.6%	-16.9%	**Total**	1.4	1.69	-.27

- So there appears to be variance between IRT & IER as follows;
  - IER is 18.6% lower on percent complete in 1st 24 hours.
  - IER av'g days per inspection is .29 days longer.

8.1.5. Inspection Pass Rates for November, 2012:

OVERALL MONTHLY AV'G @ 85.07%, compared to 84.75%, in October

Bldg:	October – 78.11%	**Elec**:	October – 84.06%
	November – 78.69%		November – 85.34%
Mech:	October – 87.49%	**Plbg:**	October – 92.02%
	November – 86.94%		November – 91.08%

- Bldg, Elec are up slightly; Mech and Plbg down <1%
- Overall average up .3%, and still well above 75-80% goal range

8.1.6. OnSchedule and CTAC numbers for November, 2012

CTAC:
- 133 first reviews, compared to 149 in October.
- Projects approval rate (pass/fail) – 80%
- CTAC was 52% of OnSch (*) first review volume (133/133+122 = 255) = 52.16%
  *CTAC as a % of OnSch is based on the total of only scheduled and Express projects

8.1.6. OnSchedule and CTAC numbers for November, 2012 (continued)

OnSchedule:
- November, 11:184 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–91.75% all trades, 93.25% B/E/M/P only
- December, 11:143 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–95% all trades, 96% B/E/M/P only
- January, 2012:136 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–78% all trades, 87% B/E/M/P only
- February, 12:139 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–74.88% all trades, 73% B/E/M/P only
- March, 12: 127 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–86.25% all trades, 87% B/E/M/P only
- April, 12: 151 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–92.25% all trades, 95% B/E/M/P only
- May, 12: 195 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–94.5% all trades, 97% B/E/M/P only
- June, 12: 235 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–98.63% all trades, 98.25% B/E/M/P only
- July, 12: 166 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–94.88% all trades, 97.5% B/E/M/P only
- August, 12: 199 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–89.5% all trades, 96% B/E/M/P only
- September, 12: 118 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–96.38% all trades, 97.25% B/E/M/P only
- October, 12: 183 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–97% all trades, 98.75% B/E/M/P only
- November, 12: 141 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–92.4% all trades, 97% B/E/M/P only

Booking Lead Times
- OnSchedule Projects: **for reporting chart posted on line**, on December 3, 2012, showed
  - 1-2 hr projects; at 2-3 work days booking lead, but MP at 8 and Health at 9 days
  - 3-4 hr projects; at 2-3 work days lead, but Bldg -10, MP – 9, & Health at 9 days.
  - 5-8 hr projects; at 2 work days lead, but Bldg-10, Elec-9, M/P–18, CMUD-11, Health-17, and City Zoning -18 days.
- CTAC plan review turnaround time; EMP at 2-3 work days, except bldg at 10 days
- Express Review – booking lead time was; 26 work days for small projects, 26 work days for large
  - Note; at 12/17/12 Express Review lead time was at 15 work days.

8.2. Status Report on Various Department Initiatives
8.2.1. November meeting follow up
8.2.1.1. RFBA betterment proposal
- On Dec 4, the BOCC approved both Department RFBA's, requesting to add the positions discussed with the BDC in the November meeting.

8.2.1.2. IRT vs. IER report
- On Dec. 5 we began using a new supporting statement on the Inspection Response Time report posting on meckpermit.com.
- The statement notes the Nov 20 discussion with BDC on this & variance with other POSSE based reports.

8.2.1.3. Developer dash
- Included request for help on this in Nov 26 e-mail to Natalie English at the Chamber
- Also sent an e-mail on Nov 29 to Theresa Salmen of NAIOP, requesting participants in the developer dash design focus group.

8.3. Updates on other Dept work
8.3.1. CSS Report follow up work
8.3.1.1. Auto-notification reconvene of CCTF
- The Department continues to focus effort on getting the word on this change out to customers, including;
    a) Soliciting opportunities to present to REBIC/HBA/NARI members, et al
    b) Devoting Consistency meeting time to it, where contractor presence merits same.
- In addition, when software availability supports, we will also work on a Department youtube style video on both auto notification and our temporary utility program

8.3.1.2. Focus Group A work
- Management met on Dec. 3, reviewing progress and outlining strategies on all 6 topics. Status as follows.
    a) <u>Timely inspections</u>; Pat G sent e-mail to focus group participants on October 19, explaining how permitting works on tankless hot water heaters.
        - Joe W & Wills H will make trade associations aware and answer any related questions.
    b) <u>Review umbrella</u>; have e-mails to Chamber & NAIOP requesting design focus group participants.
        - Also need to find ways to promote the graphic process description chart (stop signs)
    c) <u>Reach the right person</u>; needs follow up mgmt/staff meeting, reviewing how phone tree & ACD works, and how to get customers to the service point asap, while maximizing staff project time.
    d) <u>Clear explanation of changes – part 1</u>; on December 3, JNB sent directive to managers and CA's to use articles in professional association periodicals to convey process changes and code interpretations or changes.
    e) <u>Clear explanation of changes – part 2</u>; need mgmt/staff meeting to agree on strategy to emphasize the power of "NotifyMe" to customers, as well as developing a "continuing customer reminder" tool, to get key (CEM & team based service, EPS, Rehab Code, et al) issues in front of them periodically, on a repeating basis.
    f) <u>PM/CEM resource awareness</u>; mgmt/staff team need to develop a webpage concept to propose to the Chamber. Maybe add to meeting referenced in item 7.3.1.2 below.

8.3.1.3. Focus Group B work
- JNB sent a reminder request for participants to the Chamber's Natalie English on November 26. Working on a follow up meeting on this and two other points.
- Hope to get help on this from NAIOP as well, spinning out of contact noted in item 8.2.1.3 above.

8.4.   NC Building Code Council meeting Update
Lon McSwain described that the NC Building Code Council (BCC) met in Raleigh, NC on December 10. The following votes or discussions occurred, relevant to the BDC and Department's work.
- The BCC granted four new code change petitions (denying one), referring all to committees.
- The BCC held a public hearing on seven code change petitions.
- The BCC took final action on twenty-five code change petitions, approving nineteen of them.
The BCC also discussed whether or not to start the next 3 year code change process. This is about the next (2015) NC Building Code family, based on the 2012 IBC group. The BCC deferred the decision (whether to start or switch to a 6 year cycle) to their March 11 meeting.

8.5.   Manager/CA added comments
- Managers: Jeff Griffin & Gary Mullis__, Wendell__; Tim__; Chuck W__, Mark Auten__, Melanie S
- Code Administrators; Joe W__, Lon McS__, Willis H__
- Directors: Pat G__, Gene M__,

9. Future BDC agendas

- January BDC meeting tentative topics
  - RFBA vote on Ordinance changes for MP Journeyman program and "Homeowner as Contractor"
  - BDC Budget Subcommittee participants identified
  - BDC Quarterly Bulletin exercise
  - Quarterly Reports Consistency teams, Code Defect, Commercial Plan Review, TAB
  - Other
- February BDC meeting tentative topics
  - Budget Subcommittee work/status report
  - Other to be determined

10. Adjournment

The December 18th, 2012 Building Development Commission meeting adjourned at 4:17 p.m.

The next BDC meeting is scheduled for 3:00 p.m., Tuesday, January 15th, 2013.